1:14-cv-00089-TLW Date Filed 09/29/14 Entry Number 21 Page 1 of 2

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA AIKEN DIVISION

Paul Cross,

Case No. 1:14-cv-00089-TLW

**PETITIONER** 

v.

**Order** 

M. Cruz, Warden FCI Williamsburg,

RESPONDENT

Before the Court is Petitioner Paul Cross's Motion for Reconsideration of the Court's Order accepting the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation ("R&R") and denying Petitioner's § 2241 petition.

A Rule 59(e) motion may only be granted "(1) to accommodate an intervening change in controlling law; (2) to account for new evidence not available at trial; or (3) to correct a clear error of law or prevent manifest injustice. It is an extraordinary remedy that should be applied sparingly." *Mayfield v. Nat'l Ass'n for Stock Car Auto Racing, Inc.*, 674 F.3d 369, 378 (4th Cir. 2012) (citations omitted).

Petitioner raises two grounds in his motion: (1) that the Court did not properly apply § 2255's savings clause analysis; and (2) that the Court did not apply the correct standard in reviewing the R&R. Regarding the first ground, the Court carefully reviewed the filings in this case, and after that review, the Court agreed with and accepted the R&R's conclusions regarding § 2255's savings clause for the reasons correctly stated by the magistrate judge. Regarding the second ground, the Court's citation to *Wallace v. Housing Authority of City of Columbia*, 791 F. Supp. 137 (D.S.C. 1992) was to explain the standard a district judge employs when reviewing a magistrate judge's R&R, not to set forth a standard for analyzing a case purportedly brought

1:14-cv-00089-TLW Date Filed 09/29/14 Entry Number 21 Page 2 of 2

under § 2255's savings clause. There is no merit to either ground Petitioner raises in his motion

for reconsideration.

The Court has reviewed the motion and related filings, and after careful consideration,

the Court finds that Petitioner has not set forth sufficient grounds to cause the Court to alter or

amend its prior Order. Accordingly, Petitioner's motion for reconsideration, (Doc. #20), is

DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Terry L. Wooten

Terry L. Wooten

Chief United States District Judge

September 29, 2014

Columbia, South Carolina